Prospective witnesses: Carolyn Walthers; the Rowlands- 1/5/69
themen in the window/men in wrong windows Harold Weisberg

Few of the witnesses had the campaign waged against them that Arnold Louis Rowland did not buckle under. In his case, the record had to be cooked in an effort to destroy him. I go into him in part 2 of WHITEWASH II. Knebel has never said a word about what I there published about him.

Rowland was not a liar. He was self-conscious about a few things, one his incomplete education, and he misrepresented them. Everything in his testimony that can be checked does stand up, in the finest detail, as I there set forth.

He saw men in the westernmost windows of the sixth floor, assume they were part of the protection. He saw their rifle, he says. He also saw a Negro in the easternmost window, at a time that pretty much precludes Oswald having been there. This is consistent with the dubious testimony of Amos Lee Euins.

I think that because of his youth, of the efforts he and his even younger bride made to overcome the liabilities of a too-early marriage, his absolute refusal to be intimidated and the stalwart efforts made by the powerful FBI (which didn't even file reports on their intimidation visits, about six in number) and the Commission's Specter, who even mismarked photographs to make checking Rowland out more difficult, his obvious emotion and feeling of guilt for not having reported those he thought "Secret Service agents", he and his wife would be very effective before the jury. Particularly would this be true if they were first led into their personal stories and his tendency to exaggerate personal things only in order to achieve a self-respect that, as a boy, he had lost. Having disarmed the opposing counsel by having established and refuted his officially-manufactured liabilities, his story would be impressive. Carolyn Walthers, never called as a witness, does confirm him. They show the presence of those other than Oswald in that part of the building. This is both inconsistent with Oswald's having been there and consistent with the presence of others to frame him. The official handling of the Rowlands and the ignoring of Mrs. Walthers will, I think, magnify the effect.

Mrs. Rowland can be shown and testify to the change in her testimony that was not incorporated in the published evidence but was misused in the Report, together with the change in the lawyer's question that altered the sense of her answer and was published. I have this page of transcript. It is the only one, I believe, published by the Commission, which classified them as "Top Secret". Getting this before the jury, both what happened to Mrs. Rowland's correction of an error and what the lawyer did to alter the meaning of her response and the fact that even the testimony was classified "Top Secret" after it was published, should, I believe, influence the jury.

There is a good chance that Mrs. Walther's emotion will surface. She broke down when Fink Larry Schiller interviewed her. She, like the Rowlands, thought men she saw part of the protection, thinks she is in some way responsible for the President's death in not having mentioned this.